

of the gymnosperms, which the author appears to regard as derived partly from the Ferns and partly from the Lycopods.

As regards the book, viewed as a whole, it is impossible not to feel that, in spite of—perhaps partly in consequence of—its extraordinary wealth of illustration, it does not help us much farther towards a more general conception of the value and wider relations of organography as a whole. But, nevertheless, the experimental line of inquiry in this field, which Goebel himself has so ably pursued, is one which will certainly prove a fruitful one, judging from the results which have even yet accrued. And for the clear indication of this, as well as for the bringing together such a vast store of facts, the author has thoroughly earned the gratitude of his fellow-workers. It is just because there is so much of good in the book that it is difficult to avoid giving expression to that kind of gratitude which still hopes for something yet more satisfying.

J. B. FARMER.

### THE HISTORY OF THE DEVIL.

*The History of the Devil and the Idea of Evil.* By Dr. Paul Carus. 8vo. pp. xvi+488. (London: Kegan Paul and Co., Ltd. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1900.)

THE volume before us is one of considerable interest, but we must say at once that we think the history of the Devil and of the idea of evil should have been treated in a manner different from that which has been adopted by Dr. Paul Carus. The discussion of the idea of evil is a matter for the philosophical thinker, it seems to us, and the subject cannot be threshed out in detail in a single volume by any writer, however able he may be; the history of the manner in which the Devil, *i.e.*, the personification of evil, has been depicted by various peoples at various times in various places over the earth, is quite a different subject, and is, likewise, one which cannot be treated adequately in a single small volume. Dr. Carus, however, has tried to deal with *both* sides of this complex subject in one volume, and, it must be confessed, he will, in consequence, not satisfy either the philosopher or the iconographer. His book is well printed and well illustrated—though we certainly do not admire the shadowy “ghost” pictures printed in a sickly green colour on several of the pages—and to many readers it will be of interest, and probably of use also, for it may stimulate them to investigate the subject for themselves. In eighteen chapters, which vary considerably in length, the history of the Devil and the idea of evil are discussed in connection with the evidence derived from pictures, reliefs, &c., from Egypt, Akkad, Babylonia, Persia, Judea, India, China, Europe, and other countries, but Dr. Carus has not collected all the facts which he ought to have gathered together, and his deductions from those he gives are hardly correct. We do not think that “the belief in good spirits tended towards the formation of the doctrine of Monotheism,” or that “the belief in evil spirits led naturally to the acceptance of a single supreme evil deity.” Prehistoric man peopled all earth, air, sea and sky with spirits, some of whom were supposed to be hostile to him, and others benevolent; and he regarded a spirit as good or evil according to whether

it did him good or evil. When a series of good harvests came to him, or he was singularly fortunate in love, or the chase, or war, he made up his mind that the good spirits had succeeded in destroying the power of those who were evil. In process of time, to certain evil and to certain good spirits extraordinary powers were ascribed, and eventually the idea of the existence of a prince of evil, as well as of a prince of good, was formulated; terror and ignorance were the chief constituents in the worship of primitive man, and physical and moral attributes, as well as cause and effect, were often confounded by him.

Dr. Carus regards the old Egyptian god Set as the equivalent of the Devil of the later peoples of the West, but this is only partly true. He was a nature power and was the twin brother of Osiris according to one legend, and the twin brother of Horus the Elder according to another. He was the male counterpart of Nephthys who, as is well known, was not hostile to Osiris, and he must not be confounded with Ápep, the mighty enemy of Rā, the Sun-god; Set and Horus together held up the ladder whereby the deceased entered heaven, and both gods gave him a helping hand in mounting it. Dr. Carus is mistaken when he says that Set “was converted into Satan with the rise of the worship of Osiris.” We know nothing about the rise of the worship of Osiris, but we learn from the Pyramid Texts that in the fifth dynasty, when the worship of Osiris was universal in Egypt, Set was regarded as a benevolent god and a friend of the deceased. In speaking of Akkad and the early Semites, Dr. Carus is either credulous or rash, for, after saying that the Babylonians “possessed several legends which have been received into the Old Testament,” he mentions a legend of the Tower of Babel and of the “destruction of corrupt cities by a rain of fire,” reminding us of Sodom and Gomorrah. The text on which he relies for the legend of the Tower of Babel is, of course, K. 3657 in the British Museum, but a recent examination of the tablet proves that it has nothing to do with the Tower of Babel; as for the legend of the cities which were destroyed by “a rain of fire,” we cannot imagine what the authority can be. We may mention, in passing, that many of Dr. Carus’s authorities are altogether obsolete, and it is possible that one of them has led him astray on this point. His interpretations of Babylonian scenes, too, are not always correct. Thus on p. 40 the “Chaldean Trinity” is not blessing the tree of life, but is merely appearing above the conventionalised representation of the palm tree to the priest who is worshipping before the image of the god; similarly, the statement (p. 46) that the bronze tablet of the de Clercq Collection is a representation of “the world in the clutches of an evil demon” is erroneous. Any account of the demonology of the Assyrians and Babylonians which does not take into account the *Shunpu* and *Maklu* series of magical tablets which have been recently published by Tallquist and Zimmern must of necessity be most incomplete, and we are not a little surprised that Dr. Carus should have undertaken the task without doing so. The demonology of the Israelites is dismissed in nine pages, and this section of the book is most disappointing; in recent years many workers have investigated the Hebrew side of the subject of devil-lore, and an extremely interesting chapter might have been compiled from their writings. The famous

old work of Eisenmenger alone would have afforded him abundant material for a very long essay wherein every statement might have been founded upon fact.

In the chapters of Dr. Carus's work which are devoted to the "Dawn of a New Era" and "Early Christianity," the same complaint must be made, *i.e.*, he has not used existing materials. Who in these days would attempt to write about Gnosticism without giving a good account of the Pistis Sophia, or of the Book of Ieu, works from which the most valuable information on the subject is to be derived? It seems almost as if Dr. Carus had written his book to suit the pictures which he gives, without paying any attention to the system or arrangement of his work. In a treatise of such pretensions we should expect the account of the demonologies of the various Semitic nations to be kept together, and, as the devils of the Gnostics and early Christians were descendants of the denizens of the Egyptian underworld, they ought to have been described in a connected and systematic manner. It is doubtful how far the histories of the Inquisition and of the persecution of witches have any right to be in a book of this kind, but if they have, they should have been greatly shortened; in fact, Dr. Carus's work needs careful editing by a skilful but somewhat severe editor. As a picture book it is interesting enough, but as a scientific contribution to the history of an interesting and important subject it is, in our opinion, of little value.

#### SIR H. MAXWELL'S "MEMORIES OF THE MONTHS."

*Memories of the Months.* Second Series. By the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bart. Pp. xv + 295. Illustrated. (London: E. Arnold, 1900.)

IT falls to the lot of but few among us to be all-round sportsmen, good naturalists, entertaining and versatile writers, and philosophers to boot; and yet all these varied and valuable accomplishments are the attributes of the author of the delightful and entertaining volume before us. A few years ago, as the author tells us in the preface, he published selections from his notebooks of several seasons under the title quoted above, and these met with such a favourable reception that, at the request of numerous readers from both sides of the Atlantic, he has been induced to print a second series. And the public are decidedly the gainers by this resolve. For whether discussing the kind of salmon-fly best suited to any particular season or river, the utility or otherwise of birds or mammals commonly persecuted by the farmer and the gamekeeper, the kinds of shrubs and plants best suited to escape the depredations of rabbits, the ruthless slaughter of egrets for the sake of their so-called "osprey" plumes, or the accident by which the skeletons of the iguanodons of Bernissart were preserved for the delectation and wonderment of the present generation, he is equally at home, and equally free from any suspicion of dulness and pedantry.

Nothing, indeed, seems to come amiss to Sir Herbert in the matter of a text, and he has the rare faculty of making an extract from some abstruse scientific paper as full of interest as are his observations on the mammals,

birds and fishes with which he has come in contact in the ordinary course of a country life or in his field sports.

Among the subjects to which the author has paid special attention is the so-called vole-plague, which wrought devastation some years ago over wide districts in Scotland. Of the committee appointed to investigate the causes of this invasion, and, if possible, to suggest remedies, he was appointed chairman. And he gives a graphic account of the scene which met the eye during the visits of the committee to the afflicted area, mentioning the extraordinary number of short-eared owls which flocked to the feast, and of their equally remarkable fecundity as its result. Lappwings, too, are birds which come in for a special share of his attention; and although he apparently considers that much harm has not been done thus far, yet he urges that shooting a bird at one season and taking its eggs at another, or even conducting both operations simultaneously, is a sure road to its eventual extermination. While deprecating any interference with the collecting of these plovers' eggs, he suggests that the slaughter of the birds themselves should be prohibited.

An enthusiastic angler, the author holds out hopes of the possible rehabilitation of the salmon in the upper reaches of the Thames, stating that even at the present day the condition of the water at the mouth of that river is such as to offer no barrier to the upward passage of the fish. But he points out that as there are now no salmon-rivers discharging in the neighbourhood of the Thames estuary, it is essential that young salmon must be turned down in that river itself, when there would be hope that some of them would return after their first excursion to the sea. From Thames salmon the transition is easy to the question as to whether *Salmo salar* really abstains from food while in fresh water. In regard to this latter point, Sir H. Maxwell states that the experience of many anglers is practically in accord with the results of the investigation carried on by the Scottish Fishery Board, as detailed in a "blue-book" published in 1898, namely, that salmon do, as a rule, fast during the period in question. Against this evidence is, however, advanced the undoubted fact "that salmon in fresh water do take and swallow worms, minnows, and similar objects." And the pertinent question is asked with what object they take them if not to eat. "The simplest solution is probably the true one—namely, that even a physiological fast is compatible with occasional and irregular impulses of appetite, which exactly corresponds with the well-known capriciousness of salmon in taking any lure."

But to follow the author further in his interesting discussions on fish and fishing would spin out this notice to an inordinate length. And it ought to be mentioned that the mole is one of the animals he considers should be protected rather than destroyed, as it appears to be of incalculable value in destroying the larvæ of "daddy-long-legs" and other equally noxious grubs. On the other hand, Sir Herbert has not a single good word to say for the rabbit, which he terms an "accursed" creature.

Hitherto we have referred to the author's zoological and sporting notes; but an equal degree of interest is taken by him in botany, and the mention of the extraordinary abundance of holly blossom in the home counties during the summer of 1899, coupled with his observations on